

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 18-19 22 and 26-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Roccetti et al (“The structuring of a wireless internet application for a music-on-demand service on UMTS devices”, March 2002, ACM press (hereinafter “Roccetti”) in view of Schilit et al. (“m-Links: An Infrastructure for Very Small Internet Devices”, July 2001, ACM Press, pages 122-131, hereinafter referred to as “Schilit”). Claims 3-4 were rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti and Schilit, and further in view of K. Chen et al. (US 2004/0044731A1) (hereinafter “K. Chen”). Claims 5 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti and Schilit, and further in view of Langseth et al. (US 6,671,715, hereinafter “Langseth”). Claims 9 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti and Schilit, and further in view of Y.Chen et al. (“iMobile EE: an enterprise mobile service platform”, July 2003, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Vol. 9, Issue 4) (hereinafter “Y. Chen”). Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti and Schilit, in view of Applicant’s admitted prior art. Claims 13-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti in view of Schilit and K. Chen. Claims 15-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti, Schilit and K. Chen as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Langseth. Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti, Schilit and K. Chen as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Y. Chen. Claims 20-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti and Schilit and further in view of K. Chen. Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti and Schilit, and further in view of Langseth. Claim 25 was rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti and Schilit and further in view of Y. Chen. Claims 3 and 20 have been cancelled. No new matter has been introduced via this amendment.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-2, 18-19 22 and 26-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Roccetti in view of Schilit.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite in part:

*“authenticating the web-enabled device, prior to generating the list” and
“providing the list to the web-enabled device, the list including only content that is accessible to the authenticated web-enabled device from all the content available at the fax server”.*

Support for this amendment can be found for example in paragraphs [0023] and [00228]. In the present invention, the fax server 320 may include content from numerous web-enabled devices and each web-enabled device may access content available only to that particular web-enabled device (e.g., pictures, etc.) after the web-enabled device has been authenticated. The cited Roccetti, Schilit and K.Chen references fails to teach or suggest providing a list to the web-enabled device that has been authenticated and the list including only content that is accessible to the authenticated web-enabled device from all the content available at the fax server. There is no mention in Roccetti that the content provided to the UMTS device is only content authorized to be received by a particular authenticated user. In Roccetti, a typical user requests a particular MP3 and the system retrieves that MP3 song if available. Also, there is no mention in Roccetti that the top-10 service mentioned in the first paragraph of page 1069 and noted in the office action is limited to an authenticated user(s). The Schilit reference describes a system where the internet device (e.g., cell phone, etc.) performs a conventional web search (see Figs. 2a-2d) and then requests that a particular URL be faxed to a particular person, and no discussion of limiting searches to content that is authorized to the user is mentioned. Similarly, in K. Chen, although it discusses authenticating login information, there is no discussion in K. Chen of providing content to an authenticated user that is only associated with that user. In K. Chen paragraphs [0092] and [0093] all clients with valid session ID's can receive the cached contents. There is no mention in K. Chen that

DOCKET NO.: 302767.1 / MSFT-2571
Application No.: 10/692,435
Office Action Dated: June 10, 2008

PATENT

different content stored in the DCA server are available only to corresponding authenticated users.

In view of the above, it is believed that claims 1-2, 18-19 22 and 26-28 are in condition for allowance. Independent claim 13 has also been amended in similar fashion and it is also believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments. Dependent claims 4,5, 7, 10, 12, 14-17, 21, 23 and 25 are also believed to be in condition for allowance given that they add further limitations to their corresponding independent claims.

DOCKET NO.: 302767.1 / MSFT-2571
Application No.: 10/692,435
Office Action Dated: June 10, 2008

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully submits that the present invention is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: September 10, 2008

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/

Kenneth R. Eiferman

Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439